

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,893	02/27/2004	Anthony J. Andrews	248-00290	4568
Joseph J. Jochn	7590 07/30/2007 nan		EXAM	IINER
ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP			MONIKANG, GEORGE C	
Suite 1100 100 East Wisconsin Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Milwaukee, Wi	1 53202-4178		2615	
	•	·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/788,893	ANDREWS, ANTHONY J.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		George C. Monikang	2615
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>1-28</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	•	
Disnosit	ion of Claims	•	
5) <u>□</u> 6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive r (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No. <u>10/788893</u> . ed in this National Stage
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infor	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) tr No(s)/Mail Date 6/10/2004, 2/27/2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 2615

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: The purpose of the term "(isomorphic?)" is not clear to the examiner. The claim will be analyzed and rejected accordingly. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9 & 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Keele, JR., US Patent Pub. 2004/0240697 A1.

Re Claim 1, Keele, JR. discloses a loudspeaker array comprising at least one line source, said at least one line source comprising a curved one dimensional array of loudspeakers (*fig. 1; abstract*), each of which has a dispersion pattern angle of less than 60 degree. in a plane which is perpendicular to a one dimension of said one dimensional array at said loudspeakers said loudspeakers having propagation axes in a common plane (*para 0067*) which, in use, is vertical, each adjacent pair of said loudspeakers of each said line source being physically time-aligned is a direction

Art Unit: 2615

bisecting said propagation axes of said loudspeakers of said adjacent pair (fig. 2; para 0067).

Re Claim 2, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said dispersion pattern angle of at least one of said loudspeakers is less than 50.degree. in said plane perpendicular to said one dimension (para 0070: TABLE 1).

Re Claim 3, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said dispersion pattern angle of at least one of said loudspeakers is less than 40.degree. in said plane perpendicular to said one dimension (para 0070: TABLE 1).

Re Claim 4, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said dispersion pattern angle of at least one of said loudspeakers is less than 30.degree. in said plane perpendicular to said one dimension (para 0067; para 0070: TABLE 1).

Re Claim 5, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said dispersion pattern angle of at least one of said loudspeakers is less than 20 degree, in said plane perpendicular to said one dimension (para 0070: TABLE 1).

Re Claim 6, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said dispersion pattern angles of all of said loudspeakers of said at least one line source have the same value in said plane perpendicular to said one dimension (para 0070: TABLE 1 - e.g. speaker driver 118 & 120).

Re Claim 7, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said dispersion pattern angle of an upper one of said loudspeakers of said at least one line source is less than said dispersion pattern angle of a lower one of said loudspeakers (<u>para 0070: TABLE 1</u>).

Art Unit: 2615

Re Claim 8, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which all of said loudspeakers of said at least one line source have a same dispersion pattern angle in said common plane (para 0070: TABLE 1 – e.g. speaker driver 118 & 120).

Re Claim 9, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which each of said loudspeakers is horn-loaded (*para 0058*).

Re Claim 11, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which each of said loudspeakers is arranged to produce a substantially plane wave throughout a frequency range of said loudspeaker (*claim 1*).

Re Claim 12, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said at least one line source comprises at least three said loudspeakers (*fig. 1: 102-136*).

Re Claim 13, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said common plane contains said one dimension (<u>fig. 1</u>).

Re Claim 14, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said propagation axes of adjacent pairs of said loudspeakers in said at least one line source subtend an angle greater than 0.degree. and less than substantially 10.degree. (para 0070: TABLE 1- e.g. speaker drivers116 and 118).

Re Claim 15, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said propagation axes of an upper pair of said loudspeakers of said at least one line source subtend a smaller angle then said propagation axes of a lower pair of said loudspeakers (para 0070: TABLE 1).

Re Claim 16, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said at least one line source is convex (*fig.* 1).

Art Unit: 2615

Re Claim 17, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said loudspeakers of said at least one line source are disposed on an arc which is part of a a hyperbola (*fig. 1*).

Re Claim 18, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 17, in which said loudspeakers of said at least one line source are arranged to radiate away from a centre of curvature of said arc (fig. 1).

Re Claim 19, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, in which said loudspeakers of said at least one line source are of a same type (paras 0111-0114).

Re Claim 20, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, having a frequency range from substantially 250 Hz to substantially 7 KHz (para 0066).

Re Claim 21, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 1, comprising a plurality of said line sources disposed laterally adjacent each other (fig. 1; fig. 10).

Re Claim 22, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 21, in which said common plane of an adjacent pair of said line sources subtend an angle substantially equal to half a sum of said dispersion pattern angles (para 0067), in said planes perpendicular to said one dimensions, of first and second ones of said loudspeakers in first and second ones (para 0067), respectively, of said adjacent pair of said line sources (*claim 52*).

Re Claim 23, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 21, in which adjacent pairs of said loudspeakers in different ones of said line sources are physically time-aligned in a direction bisecting said propagation axes of said adjacent pair of said loudspeakers (*claim 52*).

Art Unit: 2615

Re Claim 24, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 21, in which said loudspeakers of said line sources are of a same type (*paras 0111-0114*).

Re Claim 25, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 21, in which said line sources comprise first and second sets, said loudspeakers of each said line source of said first set having a first frequency range and said loudspeakers of each said line source of said second set having a second frequency range different from said first frequency range (*paras 0023-0028*).

Re Claim 26, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 25, in which said first frequency range is one of substantially contiguous and overlapping with said second frequency range (*para 0094*).

Claim 27 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2615

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keele, JR. US Patent Pub. 2004/0240697 A1 as applied to claim 9 above, in view of Lehman, US Patent 6,112,847.

Re Claim 10, Keele, JR. discloses an array as claimed in claim 9, but fails to disclose in which each of said loudspeakers comprises inner and outer horn-loading members defining therebetween a single sound propagation channel whose shape perpendicular to said propagation axes is topologically equivalent (isomorphic?) to an annulus. However, Lehman does (*fig. 2: 13a-13d*).

Taking the combined teachings of Keele, JR. and Lehman as a whole, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to modify the loudspeaker array of Keele, JR. with in which each of said loudspeakers comprises inner and outer horn-loading members defining therebetween a single sound propagation channel whose shape perpendicular to said propagation axes is topologically equivalent (isomorphic?) to an annulus as taught in Lehman (*fig. 2: 13a-13d*) to enhance the performance of the loudspeaker.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keele, JR. US Patent Pub. 2004/0240697 A1.

Re Claim 28, Keele, JR. disclose a system as claimed in claim 27, where there are two loudspeaker arrays (*claim 36*) but fails to disclose in which a curvature of each

said line source of a first of said loudspeaker arrays is different from a curvature of each said line source of a second of said loudspeaker arrays.

Page 8

However, such a limitation is the inventor's preference thus it would have been obvious to modify the loudspeaker arrays by placing them in different curves for the benefit of creating a loudspeaker system that can cover a broader area.

Contact

· Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Monikang whose telephone number is 571-270-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. alt Fri. Off 7:30am-5:00pm (est).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

George Monikang

7/10/2007

SUPERVICE W PATTAIT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2200

Page 9